

Ser. No. 10/652,759
Group Art Unit 3671

Remarks

The rejections of Claims 7 and 8 under §102 over Brooks et al., U.S. Pat. No. 3,525,266 and under §102 over Wanie, U.S. Pat. No. 5,022,477 are respectfully traversed.

With regard to the Brooks, et al. '266 patent, the Examiner has relied first on arms 78 and 85 as corresponding to the first pair of arms in Claim 7, and arms 71 and 81 to correspond to the second set of arms in Claim 7. The '266 patent does not show the same structure that is being claimed herein. Specifically, Claim 7 is directed to a first symmetric linkage member . . . having "a first pair of arms mounted thereon and extending in opposite directions from one another; . . ." Elements 78 and 85 in the '266 patent are not connected to the same shaft. Specifically, link 85 is connected to shaft 75 ('266 patent, col. 6, lines 44-45) while link member 78 is connected to sleeve 74 ('266 patent, col. 6, lines 23-24). Thus, these two elements are not "a pair of arms mounted" on the first member.

In addition, link members 85 and 78 are extending in the same direction and not opposite directions, as required by Claim 7. Item 71 is also mounted on sleeve 74 while link 81 is mounted on shaft 75 ('266 patent, col. 6, line 42). In addition, these arms are extending in the same direction and are not extending in opposite directions, as required by Claim 7.

To the extent the Examiner is intending to rely on sleeve 74 as being the second linkage member and shaft 75 as being the first linkage member, the '266 patent also does not anticipate this claim because these two members in the '266 patent are not symmetric. The benefits of symmetry are explained in this application at page 11, lines 7-18. Having symmetric cross-links creates a more compact unit and also provides for simplified assembly as the cross-links are incapable of being installed in the unit in the wrong direction. As can be seen from Fig. 1 of the '266 patent, there is no symmetry on shaft 74 and its corresponding arms, or on shaft 75 and its

Ser. No. 10/652,759
Group Art Unit 3671

corresponding arms 81 and 85. There is also no teaching or suggestion as to any of the benefits of symmetry in the '266 patent, nor is there any suggestion as to how to modify '266 to create this present invention. Therefore, Claim 7 is not anticipated by the '266 patent and it is requested that this rejection be removed.

The rejection under the Wanie '477 patent is also traversed. In the '477 patent, arms 172 and 188 appear to be extending in the same direction. Claim 7 requires that the arms be "extending in opposite directions from one another. . ." Also, arms 202 and 196 are on the same side of the element, as shown in the '477 patent, Fig. 5, whereas the claim requires that these arms also extend opposite to one another.

Furthermore, the Wanie '477 patent linkage members are not symmetric as required by Claim 7. Therefore, the Wanie '477 patent does not teach every element of Claim 7, nor does it suggest how that design could be modified to achieve teachings of the present invention. Claim 7 is not anticipated by the Wanie '477 patent.

Claim 8 depends from Claim 7 and is allowable for the same reasons.

* * *

The rejection of Claims 10-12 under §112 has been overcome by a minor change to delete the word "external" from Claim 10. Finally, a minor change has been made to the abstract pursuant to the Examiner's objection.

Ser. No. 10/652,759
Group Art Unit 3671

It is believed that the application has complied with all outstanding requirements, and it is requested that this application be given a Notice of Allowability at the earliest possible date. Please contact the undersigned attorney if there are any outstanding issues.

Date: November 23, 2004

By: Thomas C. McDonough

Thomas C. McDonough, Reg. No. 33,734
NEAL, GERBER & EISENBERG
Two North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 269-8000

Certificate of Mailing: The undersigned hereby certifies that this document and its enclosures are being faxed to the Commissioner for Patents, 703/872-9306 this 23rd day of November, 2004.

By: Lisa Lyle

Lisa Lyle

NGEDOCs: 1093576.1